

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed February 18, 2010, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15-21, 25-28, 30, 32 and 35 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-4, 12, 20, 25-27, 32 and 35 have been amended herein. No claims have been added. As a result, claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-21, 25-28, 30, 32 and 35 remain pending for examination, with claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 32 and 35 being independent. No new matter has been added.

The amendments to the claims are supported throughout the specification. For example, support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 32 and 35 can be found in the specification at least at page 3, lines 14-17; page 7, lines 3-4; page 8, lines 29-30; page 10, line 30 s page 11, line 2; page 11, lines 7-10; page 19, lines 15-18; page 20, lines 15-21; and page 21, lines 18-22.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Gelagay in granting and conducting a telephone interview on May 13, 2010. Applicants were represented at the interview by Edmund Walsh (Registration No. 32,950). During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative provided an overview of some embodiments according to the present disclosure, commensurate in scope with the overview presented below. The claims were discussed in view of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action. The Examiner suggested that clarifying that the physical interface component generates a prompt to the second device may overcome the rejections. Each of the independent claims has been amended herein to recite limitations consistent with the Examiner's suggestions, such as to recite a prompt to invoke installation and/or authentication of the first device by the second device, and/or to invoke establishment by the second device of the non-physical connection between the first and second devices.

The remarks and amendments contained herein may serve as a further summary of the interview.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-21, 25-28, 30, 32 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite. At page 3, the Office Action asserts that a “component” as described in the specification can refer to software, and that “[i]t is unclear from the claimed limitation how ‘a physical interface component’ that is implemented as a software [*sic*] or software in execution can physically couple two devices as recited in the claims.” Each of independent claims 1, 12, 25 and 32 has been amended herein to recite, “a physical interface component comprising hardware”. Thus, it is clear that the physical interface component includes hardware that can physically couple devices. Independent claim 20 has been amended to recite, “physical interface hardware”, which is similarly clear. Applicants respectfully point out that independent claim 35 as previously presented does not recite the term “component”, and therefore the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as presented in the Office Action should not apply to claim 35 and is respectfully traversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, of independent claims 1, 12, 20, 25, 32 and 35 and dependent claims 2-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-19, 21, 26-28 and 30 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

I. Rejections Over Kurisko and Serceki

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 8, 11-12, 20, 25-27 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Kurisko et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,174,130) in view of Serceki et al.

(U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0078072). Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections.

A. *Overview of Some Embodiments*

As discussed during the telephone interview, the present disclosure relates generally to installing and/or authenticating a wireless device on a network entity (e.g., a host computer) (page 1, lines 5-8). Device installation and/or authentication can be undertaken in the process of establishing a non-physical (i.e., wireless) communication connection between the wireless device and the network entity (page 2, lines 30-31). In contrast with conventional methods of transmitting installation and authentication information wirelessly between the wireless device and the network entity, which lack efficiency and security, some embodiments of the present disclosure provide systems and methods for transmitting installation and authentication information through physical connections to a physical interface (page 3, lines 8-13).

In some embodiments, a physical connection through a physical interface can be used to transfer information from the wireless device to the network entity to identify installation and/or authentication protocols to be used in establishing a wireless connection with that particular wireless device. For example, a Bluetooth wireless device can identify a different set of protocols for installation/authentication than an Internet Protocol (IP) device (page 11, lines 15-30). The physical interface can also be used to transfer information to be used in the installation and/or authentication of the wireless device, such as information providing the location and/or identity of the particular device to be installed, security information (i.e., PIN numbers) to be used in authenticating the device, etc. (page 5, lines 2-5; page 11, lines 26-28)

In some embodiments, an invocation component may be incorporated into the physical interface component itself, for example, in a physical interface such as a cradle or wand that has a computer memory for storing information (page 3, lines 14-17; page 8, lines 7-8; page 20, lines 19-21). The installation and/or authentication information (e.g., installation/authentication protocols) can be received from the wireless device while the wireless device is physically connected to the

physical interface, and stored in a token key within the memory of the physical interface itself (page 20, lines 1-3; lines 19-21). The physical interface itself can then transfer the token key to the network entity while the network entity is physically connected to the physical interface, and can generate a prompt to the network entity to invoke the establishment by the network entity of the wireless connection with the wireless device (page 8, lines 20-30).

In embodiments in which the token key can be stored within the memory of the physical interface, the wireless device and the network entity need not be simultaneously physically connected to the physical interface in order to complete the transfer of the installation and/or authentication information. For example, the physical interface may first be physically connected to the wireless device, during which connection it may receive and store the connection information in a token key. The wireless device may then be disconnected from the physical interface before physically connecting the physical interface to the network entity and transferring the token key from the physical interface to the network entity (page 20, line 20 – page 21, line 1). Furthermore, the physical interface can be physically connected to multiple wireless devices, simultaneously or in series, and the physical interface can store connection data from all of the devices before being physically connected to the network entity in order to transfer the stored data and generate a prompt to the network entity to establish the multiple wireless connections (page 20, line 22 – page 21, line 5; page 27, lines 1-13).

The foregoing overview is provided solely for the convenience of the Examiner. It should be appreciated that each of the claims may not be limited in the manner described in the overview above. Therefore, the Examiner is requested not to rely upon the overview above for determining whether each of the claims distinguishes over the art of record, but to do so based solely upon the language of the claims themselves and the arguments presented below.

B. *Overview of Kurisko*

Kurisko describes a method to improve security during the Bluetooth pairing process (Kurisko: col. 1, lines 8-10). During pairing, the method requires a Bluetooth device to transmit

link keys to another Bluetooth device over a temporary physical connection, i.e., over a wire (Kurisko: col. 6, lines 43-50).

C. *Overview of Serceki*

Serceki describes a method of providing configuration information to a personal computer for its use in configuring its wireless network card (i.e., its “wireless station”) to join a wireless network (Serceki: Abstract, ¶37-38). The configuration information is stored on a device with a memory (e.g., a memory stick or flash drive), which is connected by USB to the personal computer to provide the configuration information to the computer (Serceki: ¶25, 29, 31).

D. *Independent Claim 1 Patentably Distinguishes Over Kurisko and Serceki*

Independent claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “the physical interface component:... generates a prompt to the second device to invoke at least one of an installation or an authentication of the first device.” Neither Kurisko nor Serceki discloses or suggests these limitations.

As discussed during the telephone interview, neither Kurisko nor Serceki describes a physical interface component that generates a prompt to a device to invoke installation or authentication of another device. As discussed above, the physical connector described by Kurisko is merely a wire that allows data to pass from one end to the other. Nowhere does Kurisko describe such a wire as being capable of generating any prompt. Serceki does not cure these deficiencies of Kurisko. As discussed above, the memory device of Serceki, which the Office Action relies upon as purportedly meeting limitations of Applicants’ claimed “physical interface component” (Office Action at page 4), does not generate any prompt to the personal computer to invoke any installation or authentication. Rather, Serceki states that the personal computer or its user must detect the memory device and execute a program to retrieve information from it (see Serceki: ¶34-35). Serceki does not describe the memory device itself as generating any prompt to the personal computer.

Even if combined, Kurisko and Serceki thus fail to meet the above-mentioned limitations of claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over any combination of Kurisko and Serceki, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 8 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

E. *Independent Claim 12 Patentably Distinguishes Over Kurisko and Serceki*

Independent claim 12 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “the physical interface component:... generates a prompt to the network entity to invoke performance by the network entity of at least one of a device installation or a device authentication”. For reasons that should be clear from the foregoing discussion of Kurisko and Serceki, these references, whether alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claim 12. Therefore, claim 12 patentably distinguishes over any combination of Kurisko and Serceki, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

F. *Independent Claim 20 Patentably Distinguishes Over Kurisko and Serceki*

Independent claim 20 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “an invocation component operatively connected to physical interface hardware..., wherein the invocation component is configured to:... generate a prompt to the network entity to invoke establishment by the network entity of the wireless connection between the wireless device and the network entity”. For reasons that should be clear from the foregoing discussion of Kurisko and Serceki, these references, whether alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claim 20. Therefore, claim 20 patentably distinguishes over any combination of Kurisko and Serceki, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

G. *Independent Claim 25 Patentably Distinguishes Over Kurisko and Serceki*

Independent claim 25 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “generating a prompt from the physical interface component to the network entity to invoke establishment by the network entity of a wireless connection between the wireless device and the network entity”. For reasons that should be clear from the foregoing discussion of Kurisko and Serceki, these references, whether alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claim 25. Therefore, claim 25 patentably distinguishes over any combination of Kurisko and Serceki, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

Claims 26-27 depend from claim 25 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

H. *Independent Claim 35 Patentably Distinguishes Over Kurisko and Serceki*

Independent claim 35 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “means for generating a prompt from the physical interface to the at least one network entity to invoke establishment by the at least one network entity of the wireless connection”. For reasons that should be clear from the foregoing discussion of Kurisko and Serceki, these references, whether alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claim 35. Therefore, claim 35 patentably distinguishes over any combination of Kurisko and Serceki, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

II. Rejections Over Kurisko, Serceki and Plasson

The Office Action rejects claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Kurisko in view of Serceki and Plasson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,688). Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections.

A. *Rejections of Dependent Claims*

Each of claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21 and 30 depends from an independent claim which, as discussed above, patentably distinguishes over any combination of Kurisko and Serceki. Plasson is cited as purportedly disclosing a daisy chain scheme, a touch-pad, a plurality of independent non-physical connections, and a particular type of wireless device, and is not cited as curing the deficiencies of Kurisko and Serceki discussed above. Accordingly, even if Kurisko, Serceki and Plasson were combined, the alleged combination would fail to meet all limitations of each of claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21 and 30. Therefore, claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21 and 30 patentably distinguish over any combination of Kurisko, Serceki and Plasson, and it is respectfully requested that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

B. *Independent Claim 32 Patentably Distinguishes Over Kurisko, Serceki and Plasson*

Independent claim 32 as amended recites, *inter alia*, “generating a prompt from the physical interface component to the network entity to invoke establishment by the network entity of non-physical connections between the first and second wireless devices and the network entity”. For reasons that should be clear from the foregoing discussion of Kurisko and Serceki, these references, whether alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations of claim 32. As discussed above, Plasson is not cited as curing these deficiencies of Kurisko and Serceki. Accordingly, even if Kurisko, Serceki and Plasson were combined, the alleged combination would fail to meet at least the above-mentioned limitations of claim 32. Therefore, claim 32 patentably distinguishes over any combination of Kurisko, Serceki and Plasson, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

III. Rejections Over Kurisko, Serceki and Chaskar

The Office Action rejects claims 13 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Kurisko in view of Serceki and Chaskar et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0066044). Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections. Each of claims 13 and 28 depends from an independent claim which, as discussed above, patentably distinguishes over any

combination of Kurisko and Serceki. Chaskar is cited as purportedly disclosing an artificial intelligence technique, and is not cited as curing the deficiencies of Kurisko and Serceki discussed above. Accordingly, even if Kurisko, Serceki and Chaskar were combined, the alleged combination would fail to meet all limitations of each of claims 13 and 28. Therefore, claims 13 and 28 patentably distinguish over any combination of Kurisko, Serceki and Chaskar, and it is respectfully requested that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

General Comments on Dependent Claims

Because each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the further distinguishing features of all of the dependent claims. However, Applicants do not necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address in the future the further patentability of the dependent claims not specifically addressed herein.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. M1103.70658US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

Mg 18, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By

Edmund J. Walsh

Registration No.: 32,950

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000